

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Development of Operational, Technical and Spectrum Requirements for Meeting Federal, State and Local Public Safety Communications Requirements Through the Year 2010)	WT Docket No. 94-86
)	
Service Rules for the 698-746,747-762 and 777-792 MHz Bands)	WT Docket No. 06-150
)	
Former Nextel Communications, Inc. Upper 700 MHz Guard Band Licenses and Revisions to Part 27 of the Commission's Rules)	WT Docket No. 06-169
)	
Implementing a Nationwide, Broadband, Interoperable Public Safety Network in the 700 MHz Band)	PS Docket No. 06-229
)	

COMMENTS OF SHARP COMMUNICATION, INC.

Sharp Communication, Inc. hereby submits these comments in response to the Commission's *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* in the above-captioned proceedings.

Sharp Communication **hopes** to see the FCC reconsider the current **proposed plan** for the 700 MHz band. While a national network might be a benefit to some cities and certainly has some advantages, it is our position that all public safety agencies should also retain the ability to license, own, and operate their own high-speed **data** systems in the 700 MHz band in addition to having an option to go on a national network.

By owning their own systems, public safety agencies in our area will **be** able to decide on their own **coverage** area, and can implement the system when they are ready rather than having to wait until a national provider **decides** that they **are ready to enter** our **market**. We are truly concerned for some of our smaller cities and communities, **as a** national provider will likely never extend **coverage** into their areas, and if they do, it will be very far into the future as they may **feel** it will not be profitable **enough**.

Sharp Communication is also concerned about the level of **local** sales & technical support that would be made available **from a single** national provider. Today, our public safety agencies have the ability to choose from a number of products **and** vendors for their wireless communication needs. **A one size fits all** solution, limiting the system choices of vendors **and** equipment **has** historically not **been** received well by public safety,

It sounds as though the FCC is considering the creation of a monopoly for the successful bidder of this nation-wide high-speed **data** system, raising serious concerns regarding the long-term impact this will have on the quality of **service** that can be **expected** for mission critical data communications. Today, wireless communication providers **know they are** competing with one **another** for public safety business, which has a **direct impact** on the quality of service. If the **expected** level of service is not met, there are **more** choices elsewhere, as mission critical public safety needs demand the very highest quality of service.

What choices will be available when the quality of service is **lacking** from a national provider of a high speed data network **and** there is no option to build a local network?

Respectfully submitted,



Trey Sharp
Sharp Communication, Inc.
May 21, 2007